A simple molecular mechanism explains multiple patterns of cell-size regulation: Supplementary Information

MD, DW, OH

July 28, 2017

Analysis

*We present in the following the results in the case where the volume of the compartment scales linearly with cell volume (*s = 1*). However, the conclusions drawn hereafter can be extended to any scaling* $(s > 0)$ *.*

Solving the dynamical Eq. (4) for the activator concentration c_a as a function of volume v and equating it to a function of the repressor concentration c_i gives an implicit equation for the volume v_f at the end of the cell cycle phase: $c_a(v_f) = f(c_i(v_f))$. In the manuscript, we considered the cases where (i) f is the unity function, and (ii) $N_{i,0}$ is a constant. In the following, we generalize our study to any functional form of f , and explore different possibilities of initial conditions. Eq. (4) can be re-expressed as follow:

$$
1 - \left(1 - \frac{c_{a,0}(k_d + k)}{\kappa_p}\right) \left(\frac{v_0}{v_f}\right)^{1 + k_d/k} = \frac{k_d + k}{\kappa_p} f\left(\frac{N_{i,0}}{v_f}\right) \tag{S1}
$$

Let's explore the conditions that are necessary to enforce size-control. Size-control is lost when the final volume is proportional to the initial volume: $v_f = \beta v_0$ where $\beta = e^{kt_f}$ for exponential growth (case of a timer). In this condition, the left-hand side of Eq. (S1) is independent of v_0 if $c_{a,0}$ is a constant. Assuming that there is an inhibitor (that is f is not a constant), and expressing $N_{i,0} = c_{i,0}v_0$:

$$
1 - \left(1 - \frac{c_{a,0}(k_d + k)}{\kappa_p}\right)\beta^{-(1 + k_d/k)} = \frac{k_d + k}{\kappa_p}f\left(\frac{c_{i,0}}{\beta}\right)
$$
(S2)

We conclude from the expression of Eq. (S2) that two different conditions can lead to a loss of size control: (i) the inhibitor and activators are regulated in such a way that their respective initial concentrations satisfy the condition expressed in Eq. (S2), which is an unlikely scenario, or (ii) both initial concentrations are constant. In this case, Eq. (S2) defines the time t_f at the end of the phase.

Note that if we consider the case where the initial number of activator is held constant, $c_{a,0} = N_{a,0}/v_0$, the previous equation reduces to:

$$
1 - \left(1 - \frac{N_{a,0}(k_d + k)}{v_0 \kappa_p}\right) \beta^{-(1 + k_d/k)} = \frac{k_d + k}{\kappa_p} f\left(\frac{c_{i,0}}{\beta}\right)
$$
(S3)

We observe that size control is enforced for small volume (β depends on v_0), but that this scenario breaks down for larger initial volume. Hence, a strict condition that enforces size-control is set at the inhibitor level: size-control is lost as soon as its initial concentration is constant.

Assuming this is not the case, and that its initial number is constant, then size-control is enforced, whichever the relationship between the final concentrations of activator and inhibitor. In particular, both the initial critical size regime and the imperfect adder regime are still holding. Indeed, for $v_f \gg v_0$, Eq. (S1) reduces to:

$$
1 = \frac{k_d + k}{\kappa_p} f\left(\frac{N_{i,0}}{v_f}\right) \tag{S4}
$$

which leads to:

$$
v_f = \frac{N_{i,0}}{f^{-1}\left(\frac{\kappa_p}{k_d + k}\right)}\tag{S5}
$$

with f^{-1} being the inverse function of f. For large initial volume, and Taylor expanding f to first order ($f(x) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 x$), Eq. (S1) reduces to:

$$
v_f = \alpha_1 v^* + (\chi + \alpha_0) v_0 \tag{S6}
$$

Hence, in general, there can be size control as long as $c_{i,0} \neq 0$. For instance, there can be a case where $N_{i,0} = a + bv_0$ that will still enforce size control. However, in this case, both regimes will be affine functions of initial volume.

Linear growth case

Some organisms, like the fission yeast *S. pombe*, are believed to display a linear growth, based on the measurement of the cell's length over time (1). The starting point for the linear growth case is the same as for the exponential growth, but now $\partial_t v = \alpha$ for some constant α . The decrease in inhibitor concentration remains unchanged. However, the equation governing the dynamics of activator changes:

$$
\frac{dc_a}{dt} = \kappa_p - k_d - c_a \frac{\alpha}{v} c_a \tag{S7}
$$

The resolution of this equation yields, replacing time by volume, like in Eq. (4):

$$
c_a(v) = \left(c_{a,0}v_0 - \frac{\kappa_p}{k_d}\left(v_0 - \frac{\alpha}{k_d}\right)\right)\frac{1}{v}e^{-k_d(v-v_0)/\alpha} + \frac{\kappa_p}{k_d v}\left(v - \frac{\alpha}{k_d}\right)
$$
(S8)

The implicit solution for the final volume becomes:

$$
\left(c_{a,0}v_0 - \frac{\kappa_p}{k_d}\left(v_0 - \alpha/k_d\right)\right)e^{-(v_f - v_0)k_d/\alpha} = N_{i,0} - \frac{\kappa_p}{k_d}\left(v_f - \alpha/k_d\right). \tag{S9}
$$

Figure A: Results of the fitting of data from Soifer et al. A-B. Probability distribution of the typical volume v^* (A) and slope χ (B), for the 490 one regime mutants (blue) and the 30 two regimes mutants (orange). Inset: histogram of k_d/k obtained from the fit of the 30 mutants. This parameter cannot be obtained for the other 490 mutants. C. Slope χ plotted as a function of typical volume v^* for all mutants.

For $N_{i,0}$ and $c_{a,0}$ independent of v_0 , this has the asymptotic solutions:

$$
v_f \approx \begin{cases} \alpha/k_d + k_d N_{i,0}/\kappa_p & \text{if } v_0 \ll \alpha/k_d + k_d N_r/\kappa_p \\ v_0 & \text{if } v_0 \gg \alpha/k_d + k_d N_r/\kappa_p. \end{cases} \tag{S10}
$$

We see that for linear growth, size-control is enforced for small initial size, whereas it it breaks down for large cells. This is in contrast with the the exponential growth case, where 2 regimes are observed before the break down of the model. The generalization to non-linear scaling of the compartment can be performed in the same way as in the case of exponential growth for small initial volume. We then find that, in particular, if the scaling is not linear, the critical size regime would depend on scaling: For $s = 2/3$, the first regime becomes a critical surface.

S. cerevisiae mutants from Soifer et al.

Out of the 520 budding yeast mutant strains analyzed, the 490 mutant strains of *S. cerevisiae* that are fit well by a single imperfect adder model show a broad distribution of v^* and slopes χ (figure S1A-B), peaked at the wild-type value. 30 mutants did not appear by eye to follow a simple affine pattern. These are shown in Fig. B, and there gene description is presented in Table S1. Note that these 30 mutants are not particularly small as compared to wild-type (see inset value of mean cell volume at birth, normalized to the wild-type value). All 30 matched the predicted pattern of a constant regime followed by an affine regime. The data presented in the main text correspond to the Cdh1 and Dbp7 mutants. We superimposed the distributions of the parameters χ and v^* obtained for these 30 mutants. We observe that they present rather large slope χ and small typical volume v^* as compared to wild type. The variation of these 2 parameters would impose a reduction of the volume at transition, if the ratio k_d/k would not increase. The third parameter of the fit for the 30 mutants is this ratio, and we observe that it indeed increase, up to very large values. We cannot extract this parameter for the other 490 mutants, but can give a lower bound of less than 10.

Figure B: Fitting of the 30 mutants displaying the two regimes predicted by our model. Each point represents mean \pm SD of the binned data. Each bin contains at least 20 points. The number in the inset represents the mean volume at birth of the mutant, normalized by the mean volume at birth of the wild-type.

Figure S1C displays the slope χ plotted as a function of typical volume v^* . We observe that there seems to be an affine relationship between the two parameters, for all the mutants (one regimes and two regimes alike), suggesting that (i) there must be some sort of compensatory mechanism in the way these two parameters change with a mutation, for which the origin goes beyond the scope of this study, and that (ii) compensatory mechanism is consistent for the apparently 2 different sets of mutants.

Case of the Cln3 mutant:

The fact that the Cln3 knockout still controls its size does indicate the existence of compensatory mechanisms. Our model does not necessitate the absolute presence of Cln3 as activator. Rather, it suggests that Cln3 is a preferred activator, but when deleted, other cyclins can compensate for its loss. This is in agreement with the fact that the slope of the second regime in Cln3 Δ is ~ 1, consistent with the absence of initial activator ($c_{a,0} \sim 0$).

Model of the budding yeast cell size regulation over the whole cell cycle.

We consider recent experiments by I. Soifer and colleagues showing that budding yeast are adders over their whole cell cycle (2), even though the size-control in G1 is an imperfect adder (3). We find that our model can give rise to an adder *over the whole cell cycle* by considering that different phases of the cell cycle have different sizecontrol mechanisms. In contrast to G1, the phase between the end of G1 and division is a "timer" (2–4): its duration, of about $t^* = 50$ minutes, is largely independent of cell size at the end of G1. In this case, the volume at division v_d is simply proportional to the volume at the end of G1 v_{G1} :

$$
v_d = v_{G1}e^{kt^*} = (\chi v_0 + v^*)e^{kt^*}
$$
 (S11)

Using the independently-measured parameter values $t^* = 50$ minutes, $k = 0.0096$ min⁻¹ (5), Eq. (S11) is in excellent agreement with the experimental data (2) (Fig. S3). The fact that two independent size control mechanisms, the imperfect adder in G1 and the timer following G1, have been tuned to combine to give a near-perfect adder $(\chi e^{kt^*} = 0.92)$ suggests that there has been selection for the adder phenotype at the whole cell-cycle level.

Note on the model presented by Soifer et al.:

Soifer et al. show that the adder phenotype could be caused by cells producing a fixed amount of Whi5 in the budded phase (2), and the end of the subsequent G1 phase triggered at a volume proportional to the initial amount of Whi5.

Their model does not agree with experimental results for the following reasons:

- 1. The authors find within their model that the amount of Whi5 at birth is a function of the cell volume at birth. This is in contradiction with recent results by Schmoller et al. (4).
- 2. The authors consider that the concentration of Cln3 is constant. This leads to a prediction that the size-control in G1 can only be an imperfect adder, with a slope $\chi \leq 1$. This is in contradiction with three results: the concentration of Cln3 does

Figure C: Prediction of size-control over the whole cell cycle, where the regulation is composed of a sizer in G1 followed by a timer. The experimental data are from Soifer et al (2), and plotted as a density contour plot. The 2 observed subpopulations correspond to the daughter cell subpopulation, and the mother cell subpopulation. Superimposed is the best fit for an adder regulation (slope of 1 in the plot) that would emerge from the incremental model.

increase at the beginning of G1 to reach a steady-state (4), (ii) we do observe in a number of circumstances the presence of 2 regimes, even in the wild-type situation (Fig. 2), and (iii) in the case that the size-control is only an imperfect adder, we observe instances where the slope $\chi \geq 1$.

Hence, we argue that some of their key hypothesis are not supported experimentally, and lead to predictions that are not verified experimentally, suggesting that the extension of the incremental model, proposed to describe size-control in bacteria and even if it agrees experimentally with some data, still presents some caveats. Our model better takes into account (i) the initial conditions (ii) and the molecular dynamics giving rise to size-control. We find that the pseudo-adder behavior observed over the whole cell cycle may just be the result of different size-control mechanisms in different phases of the cell cycle. With this in mind, we predict that the extended incremental model will break down in the case of certain mutants over the whole cell cycle, as it cannot readily explain the size-regulation of mutants in the G1 phase of the cell cycle.

Table A: Gene description of the 30 mutants displaying the 2 regimes.

 \circ

References

- 1. Nobs, J.-B., and S. J. Maerkl, 2014. Long-term single cell analysis of S. pombe on a microfluidic microchemostat array. *PloS ONE* 9:e93466.
- 2. Soifer, I., L. Robert, and A. Amir, 2016. Single-cell analysis of growth in budding yeast and bacteria reveals a common size regulation strategy. *Current Biology* 26:356–361.
- 3. Soifer, I., and N. Barkai, 2014. Systematic identification of cell size regulators in budding yeast. *Molecular systems biology* 10:761.
- 4. Schmoller, K. M., J. Turner, M. Kõivomägi, and J. M. Skotheim, 2015. Dilution of the cell cycle inhibitor Whi5 controls budding-yeast cell size. *Nature* 526:268–272.
- 5. Ferrezuelo, F., N. Colomina, A. Palmisano, E. Garí, C. Gallego, A. Csikász-Nagy, and M. Aldea, 2012. The critical size is set at a single-cell level by growth rate to attain homeostasis and adaptation. *Nature communications* 3:1012.